DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 584 CE 051 660

TITLE Hearing on National Youth Corps, H.R. 18 and H.R. 460. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, One Hundredth Congress, Second Session.

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.

PUB DATE 15 Jun 88

NOTE 48p.; Serial No. 100-81. For related documents, see CE 051 658-661.

AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.

PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Adult Basic Education; Citizen Participation; Community Development; *Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Needs; *Employment Programs; *Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Hearings; Job Training; Postsecondary Education; Program Implementation; Public Policy; *Public Service; Young Adults

IDENTIFIERS Congress 100th; Pennsylvania; *Youth Service

ABSTRACT

This document contains transcripts of oral and written testimony from witnesses at a hearing on H.R. 18 and H.R. 460, which would create a National Youth Corps. The National Youth Corps proposal links two other proposals, the Conservation Corps bill and the National Youth Service bill, into a comprehensive bill to provide alternatives for youth in both urban and rural areas. The National Youth Corps bill proposes to hire young people to perform public service, such as conservation and clean-up chores, at minimum wage. The Youth Corps also would provide some education, provide job-placement assistance after the 2-year program, and possibly provide dormitory-style housing and supervision. Testimony from Scott Thomson, Executive Director of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, and Harris Wofford, Secretary of Labor and Industry of Pennsylvania, is included, along with prepared statements from a Civilian Conservation Corps alumnus and from Representative Wayne Dowdy and Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, as well as the two witnesses. (KC)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED303584

# HEARING ON NATIONAL YOUTH CORPS, H.R. 18 AND H.R. 460

## HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

OF THE

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, JUNE 15, 1988

**Serial No. 100-81**

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CEO 516660

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
88-597 WASHINGTON : 1988

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
ROBERT E. WISE, JR., West Virginia
TIMOTHY J. PENNY, Minnesota
BILL RICHARDSON, New Mexico
TOMMY F. ROBINSON, Arkansas
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
CHESTER G. ATKINS, Massachusetts
JAMES JONTZ, Indiana

JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina

---

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California, *Chairman*

PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
CHESTER G. ATKINS, Massachusetts
JAMES JONTZ, Indiana
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
(Ex Officio)

STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
(Ex Officio)

# CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Hearing held in Washington, DC, on June 15, 1988 | 1 |
| Statement of: | |
| Thomson, Scott, executive director, National Association of Secondary School Principals | 11 |
| Wofford, Hon. Harris, Secretary of Labor and Industry, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania | 2 |
| Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera: | |
| Daughdrill, Paul D., national legislative director, National Association of Civilian Conservation Corps Alumni, prepared statement of | 33 |
| Dowdy, Hon. Wayne, a Representative in Congress from the State of Mississippi, prepared statement of | 42 |
| Moynihan, Hon. Daniel Patrick, a U.S. Senator from the State of New York, prepared statement of | 28 |
| Thomson, Scott D., executive director, National Association of Secondary School Principals, prepared statement of | 14 |
| Wofford, Hon. Harris, Secretary of Labor and Industry, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, prepared statement of | 7 |

# NATIONAL YOUTH CORPS, H.R. 18 AND H.R. 460

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 1988

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
*Washington, DC.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:32 a.m., in room 2257, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Matthew G. Martinez (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Martinez, Jontz, Gunderson, and Murphy.

Mr. MARTINEZ. The subcommittee will come to order now, and I will make just a very brief statement. We might as well have our two witnesses come forward to the table so that they might be ready to begin their testimony by the time I finish my statement.

We are holding this hearing to receive more testimony on what I consider to be one of the best youth service bills to come along in a long while. Youth service concerns giving our young people alternatives to what is out there now and putting them to productive use where they can have confidence in themselves and have confidence in their futures.

Unfortunately, one of our key witnesses, Mr. Gary Walker from the Public-Private Ventures, had to cancel at the last minute due to a back injury he suffered, so he will not be with us, but he will submit his testimony for the record in the very near future, and we will include it.

As we continue the process of moving this youth service legislation, we are hopeful that members of the committee who share a strong commitment to the youth of our Nation will work with us to come up with the best possible program for national youth service.

Chairman Panetta, Congressman Udall, and I, as well as the majority leadership would like to see a youth service bill in this Congress. One portion of this bill, as we have combined two bills, has twice passed both Houses and has been pocket vetoed once by the President. Reagan's veto was contrary to what he did when he was Governor of the State of California. He must have thought it was a great idea then, because he not only signed a similar bill into law but he also took great credit for it.

We hope that before he leaves office this bill is passed and he has a change of heart and signs this into law.

We are looking forward to hearing from the expert witnesses today, and I understand one of the gentlemen, the Secretary of Labor from Pennsylvania, Mr. Wofford, is going to be introduced

by a good friend and colleague of ours on the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. Austin Murphy.

Mr. Murphy.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I do appreciate the opportunity of sitting with you this morning as you consider this very important legislation, and it is my very great pleasure to be able to introduce to you the Secretary of Labor and Industry from my home Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Mr. Harris Wofford.

We welcome you back to Washington, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. Wofford served here with the Kennedy administration several years ago, and we welcome him back. Mr. Wofford is an eminent attorney in Pennsylvania. He is a former professor at both Notre Dame and Howard Universities in labor-management relations. He is also an author and, presently, is serving in the Governor's cabinet as our secretary of labor and industry.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce to you my friend and neighbor, Mr. Wofford.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you very much, Mr. Murphy and welcome, Mr. Wofford.

We have our first two witnesses. Let me introduce them formally. We have the Honorable Harris Wofford, Secretary of Labor and Industry of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and Dr. Scott Thomson, executive director or the National Association of Secondary School Principals, who is from my own home State of California. He is from northern California, and sometimes we worry about the north seceding from the State of California every time we ask for a little water, but, nevertheless, they still are a part of California. So, we welcome him here as a fellow Californian.

With that, we will begin with Mr. Wofford.

## STATEMENT OF HON. HARRIS WOFFORD, SECRETARY OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WOFFORD. Thank you, Congressman Martinez and thank you, Congressman Murphy.

I guess Scott and I are lucky to be warmly welcomed by colleagues. We appreciate it. I also appreciate greatly your leadership, Mr. Chairman, and that of your colleagues in advancing this bill, because it seems to me the time is right.

I want to apologize for the slim statement that is before you. I hope to have the opportunity to amend and correct and submit a proper one.

It was a hot day yesterday in more ways than one. Our House of Representatives in Pennsylvania passed the annual 1988-89 budget. In it is a $500,000 appropriate for citizen service in Pennsylvania, but until late yesterday afternoon and evening, I was not able to focus properly on what I want to submit to you, but we will do our best this morning and will submit for the record the more complete testimony.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Let me just interrupt you at that point and say that the record will remain open for 3 weeks, and we look forward to your revised statement.

Mr. WOFFORD. Thank you.

As the first band of Peace Corps volunteers left the Rose Garden, a reporter asked one of those volunteers why he, a member of the supposed apathetic generation, the me first generation, the silent generation—they were called all sorts of things—had joined the Peace Corps along with hundreds and thousands of others who had applied to an agency that didn't even exist. In fact, I was on the talent search for the new Administration under Sargent Shriver, and we got more letters from around the country asking to be part of the Peace Corps than for all other government jobs put together. It was quite a phenomenal response, and it is that response that led John Kennedy to go ahead full speed with the Peace Corps by Executive order.

Anyway, that volunteer was asked why did you do it, and he replied, "I'd never done anything patriotic, unselfish, or for the common good before because nobody asked me to; Kennedy asked," he said.

I believe that it is time for a new generation of Americans to be asked to serve, and I hope that the next President, whoever he is, will ask all citizens to serve and will make that ask as strong a verb as John Kennedy made it when he called on us to ask not what our country can do for us but to ask what we can do for our country and for the freedom of man.

But I doubt that any one President today or any political leader can have the effect that John Kennedy had in an earlier, less skeptical era. We need now, therefore, if we want to get large numbers of our young people and of our citizens, larger numbers than ever before to volunteer to serve on a variety of fronts, we need to find the ways that society can do the asking through the new means of communication such as television and by invoking all the forces of persuasion available to us.

That is a challenge to our imagination and to social invention. The Congress can play an important part, I believe, in that process.

It has a special role in discovering and providing the ways and means that will encourage and make it possible for all to serve. The proposed Youth Service Corps, these bills, would be a very important step in the social invention that now seems to be required.

The Peace Corps was one such invention. It has challenged and enabled some 125,000 Americans to serve in more than 100 countries. Actually, when we were in the formation of the Peace Corps, Sargent Shriver, Robert Kennedy, John Kennedy, others of us imagined that within a few years, it would go from the 15,000 volunteers a year it reached in the mid-1960's to 100,000 volunteers a year, and they also hoped, as the war on poverty was first being planned, that there would be a million strong domestic peace corps. In fact, they dreamed of a million strong senior citizens volunteers corps.

The two together, the VISTA corps and the senior citizen corps they imagined would be a pincer's movement that would close in on complacent society and help win the war on poverty.

In any case, though it has fallen far short of reaching numbers such as those, 125,000 Americans have served. Yet, the Peace Corps and the domestic peace corps that was named VISTA obviously provide opportunities for only a small fraction of people in our society to serve. Those pioneer agencies are lonely.

Now, In Pennsylvania, under Gov. Robert Casey, we are launching a new initiative in citizen service, sometimes called PennSERVE. Our aim is to act as the extraordinary extended family that Governor Casey calls on Pennsylvania to become, one that shares its benefits and its burdens and achieves greatness when it leaves no one out and no one behind.

The appropriation that passed yesterday, the $500,000, will primarily go to assist in the funding of and in technical assistance to two new urban youth service corps for full-time service for young people. They will join the ranks of two such corps in Philadelphia that were formed this year by private sector initiative and community initiative with significant support from our Department of Labor's federally funded Job Training Partnership Act program.

That would make four such corps in Pennsylvania to stand alongside the Pennsylvania Conservation Corps which has a distinguished record. It has enabled some 6,000 people to serve and to be served over the last 4 years. $40 million has been spent, $14 million of that in hardware and supplies and materials and site development.

Tomorrow, the Governor and others of us will visit two of those sites, in Presque Isle and in the re-doing of the Niagara flagship of the Navy. It has been estimated by studies that went to work on this that for every $1 of money invested in the Pennsylvania Conservation Corps, $1.38 in products have been produced. It would have cost at least that if this work had been done otherwise.

It is a tradition that we want to build on in Pennsylvania on the full-time youth corps front, but I point out that even with the programs I just noted, only a small fraction of Pennsylvania young people would be able to serve.

The needs, however, are being charted and, in some cases, have been charted. The needs for large numbers of full-time youth service in Pennsylvania are there. The need for stipends and financial support that will enable a wide range, a diverse range of young people, rich and poor, black and white, suburban and inner city to work together in meeting those needs.

That need of the financial support, whatever you want to call it be it stipend, expenses, fellowship for service, is crucial if we are to expand on a large scale.

Now, I wont try to invade Scott Thomson's territory too far, but just a small invasion is pertinent, because Governor Casey believes a crucial part of the citizens service program for Pennsylvania—in fact, he believes the cutting edge of it—should be asking all high school students to engage in substantial hours of community service as part of the curriculum for graduation from high school in our State.

He is not proposing that be done by mandate by a State law at this point. He is proposing it be done by persuasion of 501 school districts. He is not proposing any one model to be imposed on every school district which would be impossible if we tried it. He is asking for invention in every one of these school districts as to how to do it most effectively for meeting the needs of the communities and meeting the needs of those young people.

The Governor's Office of Citizen Service which will be set up if the Senate now joins the House in approving it will work with the

Department of Labor and with planning groups we are helping now to get started in 67 counties, and we now have the collaboration of the school boards association which just this very day, I think—at least, I got it this morning—issued a bulletin calling on school board leadership in shaping citizens service programs in their schools.

The State Association of School Boards, of principals, of superintendents, and the two teachers' unions are all collaborating in this effort in Pennsylvania.

It is a cost effective way in which you can ask one sector of our population, all of it, to participate. It is going on already in, I think, all the Catholic schools in Pennsylvania and all the Quaker schools. A notable program is the Episcopal Academy.

The Governor's own children went to Scranton Prep, a Jesuit school which has one of the most distinguished records in making this kind of community service by students effective, and it has been doing it for some years.

We believe that the role for this in the public schools, potentially—in numbers, obviously—is even greater, but in terms of the kind of community service that could be rendered with a very diverse population working together is extraordinary.

I am just reporting on Pennsylvania to convey to you that there is one State that is delighted that you are taking the leading in putting in a Federal frame and with Federal funding the ways and means by which States and local communities can take initiative and have some support and collaboration from the Federal Government. These bills would make a great difference in enabling us to carry through this quantum jump in citizen service in Pennsylvania.

The competition we are in with some other States may encourage you, too. There was a conference at Brown the report on which I strongly commend to you which I will submit in addition.

It was at Brown University a couple of months ago at which the States of Ohio, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania competed a little bit in advancing and proposing and defending their plans for quantum jumps in citizen service. The Governor of Minnesota is all out in seeking to do this. He is also doing it as head of the Educational Commission for the State. I believe this year it is going to be one of the themes or the theme of his tenure.

The Governor of Ohio is. There are also some other States. This is the kind of competition you should want.

In other words, I am suggesting that there is a critical mass for this idea now going on in the country, and what you are doing reminds me very much of what helped produce the Peace Corps in the first place.

It didn't come out of the head of John Kennedy alone one night in Ann Arbor, MI when he first in the campaign raised the idea of a Peace Corps late at night to 10,000 people who were assembled there after midnight waiting for him, and he put these rhetorical questions to them as to whether they would serve in such a corps if it were formed. He brought that out of his head unplanned that night—you can hear the tape extemporaneously, and you will see how unplanned it was—because there had been a number of bills in the House and the Senate.

Senator Humphrey had been proposing the Point Four Youth Corps. Congressman Reuss had been advancing bills for three or four years. John Kennedy was a sponsor for one of those bills.

It was in his head, because it was in the air. Again, I think you have a pioneering role to play by advancing these bills. Far, far better will be if you can get them passed, but just this process that you are undertaking is a major contribution.

I think really that is enough for me to lay out for you at this point. I would enjoy very much talking with you on any of these matters after Scott Thomson has made his presentation.

I am tremendously encouraged because this idea seems to be advancing on both fronts, the Republicans and the Democrats. As you know, the Democratic Leadership Council has produced an outstanding proposal in Citizenship, A National Service, a document that Senator Nunn released. Senator Dole's submission to the Republican Platform Committee I read last night. I couldn't change a word in it. I hope it is the platform of both parties. He is strongly advocating exactly the approach that I have been talking about this morning.

The Youth Service America Program is cochaired by Senator Bradley and Senator Nancy Kassebaum.

If you look at the basic literature that has now been put together, the Serving America report which is on the table here of the Human Environment Center shows how this approach is being pursued in State after State. I guess the numbers now are in the 1950's of programs that are in the category that these bills would help so much.

I think we are ready for the quantum jump, and we in Pennsylvania want to work closely with you on these bills and on delivering what the great promise is.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Harris Wofford follows:]

*Testimony of Harris Wofford*
*June 15, 1988*

*United States House of Representatives*
*Committee on Education and Labor*
*Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities*
*The Youth Service Corps -- HR 18 and HR 460*

As the first band of Peace Corps volunteers left the Rose Garden for their countries of service a reporter questioned one man why he, a member of the supposed self-centered '50's generation, joined the Peace Corps. The volunteer replied: "I'd never done anything patriotic, unselfish or for the common good before because nobody ever asked me to. Kennedy asked."

It is time for a new generation of Americans to be asked to serve. I hope the next President will ask all citizens to serve and will make that **ask** as strong a verb as John Kennedy made it when he called on us to us to ask not what our country can do for us, but what we can do for our country and the freedom of people.

The Peace Corps, and VISTA were social inventions created to back-up rhetorical asking with institutional asking. The Peace Corps has challenged and enabled over 125,000 Americans to serve in over 100 countries.

But the Peace Corps is lonely in that role. If it is true that education, work, and service to society should be part of the mixture of all people's experience -- because each dimension is fundamental to human development and particularly to developing citizenship in a democracy -- then it follows American society should ask youth to serve to serve as a normal part of the maturation process. And it should provide opportunities for all to serve.

---

In Pennsylvania, under the leadership of our Governor, Robert Casey, we are launching a major new initiative in Citizen Service, PennSERVE. Our aim is to act as the "extraordinary extended family" Governor Casey calls us to become, "a family which shares its benefits and its burdens. A family which achieves greatness when it leaves no one out and no one behind." PennSERVE asks people to serve because only then can we mobilize the resources to assure no one is left out or left behind. Only through citizen service can Governor Casey's dream become reality.

And there is much to be done...so many being left out. One out of every 5 Pennsylvania students are at-risk of dropping out of school -- and into crime, drugs or unemployment. One in 5 is at risk of becoming a teen parent. Compounding the problems of our wasted youth, our older population is growing as a percentage of the whole, and will depend on these troubled and seemingly unconnected youth to provide care and security for them. Sadly, many youth are unprepared to shoulder that burden. In the Delaware Valley in the eastern part of our state employers futilely seek employees capable and prepared to work while thousands of illiterate untrained people live within easy commute.

We desperately need a different type of preparation for work and life, one I call Citizen Service, if these people are to ever answer the call of their brothers and sisters to help shoulder common burdens, in order that we might leave no one out and no one behind. We need a new ethic, an ethic of service.

Pennsylvania's and this nation's need for public services of the kind the Youth Services Corps would provide is great NOT only because it accomplishes much needed public work. Today, little is asked of young people except they be consumers of goods and services. A vast industry serves youth with schooling, entertainment, and goods of all kinds, but offers limited opportunities for the young to produce goods and serve others. What makes the need great is that it begins to right the institutional apathy corrupting youth of whom little is asked. This bill begins the asking.

The youth I come into contact with feel something is missing, but they can't identify what it is. Many people identify these youth's emptiness as indicative of the "lost generation." But it is not. It is rather youth's cry, expressing our -- their leaders' -- failure to challenge them. If we indict youth as "selfish, materialistic, lost" we indict ourselves for not answering their pleas to involve them in regenerating communities, in caring for their neighbors, in giving them responsibility for tutoring a friend, in being great. We indicte ourselves for not offering them something to do besides be "selfish, materialistic" by calling them "lost." The recent poll completed by

A 1980 survey of youth's attitudes, compared to those of the general public, found an enormous gap between their desire to serve and the opportunities available. **About 92%** of 14-20-year-olds wanted to participate in making their community a better place to live. This was the highest of four age groups surveyed, and higher than the general public's desire, measured at only 85% (Youth and America's Future: The William T. Grant Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship, Anne Lewis, p.9). They want to participate. They don't have the opportunity to participate.

Corraborating these findings is Louis Harris, who in a 1985 survey concludes the "youth population has been misnamed the self-centered generation. There is a strong desire to serve others. The problem we face in America today is not a lack of willingness to serve or to help others but to find the appropriate outlet for this. Young people are deprived of responsibilities and cut-off from real life activities important to the adult community. They are only allowed to wait to be grown-up. And they are bored.

---

Yes, there is need for national legislation on the matter of youth service.

We must re-direct opportunities for youth, so that they may serve. And it, if it is to be successful, must be done on a large scale -- involving over 2 million youth annually, costing several billion dollars. I commend Congressman Martinez, Congressman Panetta and Congressman Udall, for taking the lead and introducing, coordinating and unifying The Youth Services Corps formerly HR 18 and HR 1405.



12

Some may be shocked at the large numbers I propose. But if we redirect and rewrite current statutes to recognize an ethos of service as the effective "rite of passage" it is for youth especially and for others, it will not require much additional commitment. And if we consider what the American people currently do in the realm of service, it becomes obvious a National Service corps is necessary to provide federal leadership in tying loose ends together.

Most existing programs say, in effect, "Here is training or work designed to help you -- the poor and racially divided -- to take you off the streets, get you a job, give you a better chance." Let us say something very different from this degrading approach, something like: "We need you and ask you -- along with other young people -- to serve your community and country and world in demanding and disciplined work of great importance to everyone." The immediate numerical results would be similar, but the psychological ones would not. Having good done for you, or to you, is not the best way to build the interdependance, social responsibility, and self-confidence. Both get people off the streets. But only one EMPOWERS people to feel the importance they have in a democratic society.

Consider also that The United States is unique in the industrialized world for its lack of a national service system. West Germany's National Service involved 60,000 young people in their mental hospitals last year, for example. At a time when technological change, poverty, and foreign competition cast millions into unemployment or into unproductive dead-end jobs, we are challenged to find new ways to tap the greatness in every citizen, challenged to find new ways to prepare people and youth for citizenship. Asking they serve, not requiring they participate, is that rite of passage for all people into productive citizenship.

Thirdly, George Gallup reports in his latest survey of American's voluntary spirit, volunteerism remains a pervasive activity for the American population. In 1985 nearly one-half of all Americans 14-years or older, about 89 million people, volunteered. **And 52% of teenagers,** higher than the national average, volunteered. Combine this amount of volunteering with American's favorable opinion about creating a national service corps -- 83% of all people -- and we see there already is a service mandate out there, needing federal leadership (Gallup, December 1987)

---

Consider the economic impact of what currently happens. Youth Service America estimates youth service alone is nationally a billion resource harnessing 2.50 million hours of public service annually (What Is Youth Service Today?, p.1). **Gallup estimates volunteers contributed $110 billion worth of goods and services** in 1985. Furthermore, the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps estimates over $1 is returned in completed project for every public $1 spent on service corps. Our Pennsylvania Conservation Corps provides $1.38 of finished project for every $1 we spend, providing $20.7 million for the $15 million we budgeted this year.

These numbers are compelling. But further economic justification must not focus on such effects, but on cause. Dr. Bernard Anderson, a Professor at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, believes we need a "calculus

that permits short-term costs and long-term benefits to be compared on equal terms." He and I believe short-term costs and benefits -- wages, the number of people assisted, length of trail restored -- can be measured. Since National Service would produce real goods and services, the program could have positive effects on the economy. But these are not the effects we should focus on. Rather we should realize we cannot measure Service's every benefit to society and person. There are immeasurable benefits.

The experience of national service could alter attitudes toward work in our society by demonstrating the satisfaction that comes from doing well any job needed and valued. How do we quantitatively measure that? National Service could radically change society's conception of youth. Service could empower more people to lead healthier happier lives. How do we measure that? National Service could purposefully engage millions in constructive thought on communal action. How do we quantitatively measure that? It is like trying to economically justify the Bill of Rights.

The questions of the cost versus benefit of national service and of the Bill of Rights rest on a value judgement. Do we as a whole value these benefits (free speech, the right to bear arms, the right to act as a citizen, to right to serve your nation and world) and what dollar trade-offs are we prepared to make in order to support these values?

With 2 million youth out of school and out of work, another 2 million, described as The Forgotten Half: Non-College Youth in America by the William T. Grant Commission, deprived of the benefit of any higher education to smooth the school-to-work transition, I suggest we are prepared to make any sacrifice to bear the burdens my governor asks all Pennsylvanians collectively shoulder.

---

In 1979 I wrote:

> *Until the spirit of service is restored among American citizens, the most pressing human problems of our society will not be solved.*

I see no reason to change my mind.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you very much, Mr. Wofford.

One of the things that comes to my mind as you are speaking is the ability, through these programs, to restore pride of self and country in young people who need something right now. I think you are right, that there is a movement afoot now that this is the time for this idea to come to fruition.

Mr. Thomson, we are going to start your testimony. You will have to excuse me for just a few minutes. I have to meet with someone. I want to ask Mr. Murphy to take over while I am out. I shouldn't be more than 5 or 10 minutes.

## STATEMENT OF SCOTT THOMSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Mr. THOMSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am pleased to be able to offer testimony in support, specifically, of H.R. 18 but, certainly, more generally in support of the notion of national service. The organization I represent, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, a membership organization of 40,000 high school principals and junior high school principals across the country and in Canada as well. We have 1,200 members in Canada.

We have supported the notion of community service in schools and youth service generally for two decades. This is not a new cause for us, and I would like to underline that point. Going clear back to the late 1960's and early 1970's, my organization has been a strong advocate for community service at the local site and for a national youth service program.

I am sensitive about two mistakes in my written testimony—and I am not going to read the testimony, but I would like to pause for a moment for those who have copies of my testimony and make two corrections. Mr. Wofford has been busy; I have been busy, too. From the time that I developed this testimony, I have been to Austin, TX to a State meeting of principals and to New York City to a meeting of the trustees of the college board, and I just did not have a chance to proofread this, and I apologize to all of you.

The point I am trying to make is that in the second paragraph of my testimony, the sixth word should read "causes," not "courses." Educators become involved in many causes beyond the classroom door.

The other mistake is on the very last page in the last line of the next to the last paragraph. It should read, "the opportunity to solve some of the most pressing of its social problems." I don't know any promising social problems. If anybody in the room does, I would certainly seek your counsel following this meeting.

So, I now feel better about this testimony.

Why should educators support national service? Why should educators support a program that could potentially reduce the number of students in a classroom?

That, it seems to me, would be an initial question anyone would ask someone like me. The answer is short and direct. The answer is that the classrooms do not meet all of the needs of all of the students that come to school.

We perhaps, as educators, understand that better than the general public. We perhaps understand the difficulties that many students have in coming to school 5 days a week on a consistent basis, sitting in class, and dealing with abstract symbols in mathematics and English class when they have many problems at home or when they in fact perhaps don't read or compute sufficiently to succeed in class.

We have also for a long time supported the notion of action learning or service learning. We were very active as an organization back in the late 1960's and early 1970's in promoting this notion.

Even though community service has not been in the public news in the 1980's, particularly with the advent of the reform reports which focus primarily on academic learning—and that is fine; we need good academic learning as well—what has happened is that very little public attention or notice has come to something in schools that has been pretty well maintained, and that is interest in community service, interest in community service education.

We estimate that at least 20 percent of the high schools in the country today have some form of community service education or service learning. We know specifically that certain school districts like the entire Atlanta, GA school system, the Cherry Creek school system which is a suburb of Denver, and others require some form of community service for graduation.

So, we have two reasons here. One is that students need to learn outside of school as well as in, and number two is we have a pretty healthy, very idiosyncratic, highly differentiated, community by community service program that is successful. Believe me, if students weren't gaining from this service learning in these individual schools, you can believe that the school boards and others would not support them at the level that they do.

Now, more importantly and to the point of a national service program, there actually are skills that students can learn in reading and writing and arithmetic better in a non-classroom setting than in a classroom setting.

This may sound like heresy, but the fact is we have evidence from programs that were in place in the 1970's—I cite Hillsboro, OR as one example—where research was conducted with a control and an experimental group and, in fact, a group of 25 students that were given arithmetic problems in real working situations in the community in the afternoons were required to write reports on what they had accomplished and what they were planning to do in their various community service projects. At the end of the year, they scored better on tests of reading and math than did a matched set who stayed in the classroom.

I don't mean by that to imply that all learning should be in community settings. What I am saying is that there are individual differences and that some students can in fact even develop not only better attitudes and not only learn work skills, but, in fact, we have good evidence to show that they can learn to read and write better in campus settings, some students, as well.

The next logical question to ask is, what services might be needed out there? Does our Nation have an opportunity for larger

numbers of students to serve, larger numbers of youth to serve in various programs than today?

The answer is yes in capital letters. I note in my written testimony the problems faced by an English teacher with 5 classes of 30 students. If that teacher took only 10 minutes to correct an essay, that teacher has committed 25 hours of paperwork if she or he just spends 10 minutes on each of the 150 students' essays a week.

That just is a small indication of the problems that our teachers face around the country in trying to improve the achievement of at risk students, because teaching at risk students is a labor intensive occupation. You can't do it in classes of 30 and be successful.

The at risk student population is growing, as we know. To put it in another way, those students that have been traditionally the least best served by schools, those minority populations are growing, and if we need anything in this country, it is more labor at the school level to improve the skills of at risk students.

There is almost no limit to the number of young people that could serve in this capacity, but if we are talking about those students not so much who need the skills but those students, as Mr. Wofford said, want an opportunity for service, there is a wonderful place as teacher aides to serve in schools. And if you have never seen a 16 or 17-year-old girl teach a 5 or 6-year-old youngster reading, you have missed something, because there is a natural capability, it seems, among older youth to be able to relate to and have the patience to teach to young people.

The need is out there in schools. The need is out there in all of the social problems and pathologies that we have in this country ranging from drug abuse among high school youth to problems with the elderly and, of course, the homeless problem that we have. There are at least 20 problems that we could all list that need resolving out there in addition to those I mentioned in schools.

So, in sum, there is a benefit to service programs that is well documented not only by the Peace Corps but by community service programs in schools. We are not even serving 10 percent of the potential needs that are out there. The benefits are documented both from the standpoint of skills learned and attitudes.

All this, in sum, means that this Nation doesn't have a youth policy. We are the only Nation that I am aware of the industrial nations that seems to identify the youth policy and school policy as one policy. We don't have a youth nutrition policy. We don't have a youth jobs policy. We don't have a youth character development policy. As I mentioned in my written testimony, our character development seems to consist of seeing our youth as a market for Pepsi and potato chips rather than something more constructive.

So, I would propose in closing, Mr. Chairman, that we see a national program of service, a national service program as being perhaps the centerpiece and the beginning of a national youth policy.

I appreciate this opportunity to testify.

[The prepared statement of Scott D. Thomson follows:]



88-597 O - 88 - 2

nassp

YOUTH SERVICE CORPS: PERSISTENT DREAMS

Statement to the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities
Committee on Education and Labor
U.S. House of Representatives
for H.R. 10

by

Scott D. Thomson, Executive Director
National Association of Secondary School Principals

June 15, 1988

**National Association of Secondary School Principals**
1904 Association Drive • Reston, Virginia 22091 • (703) 860-0200

better education for all American youth

The Honorable Matthew G. Martinez
Chairman
Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am pleased to represent to your Committee the National Association of Secondary School Principals, an organization of 40,000 high school and middle level principals located across the United States, in Canada, and overseas. We have the direct responsibility for educating America's 22 million youth between ages 12 to 18, in 19,000 high schools and about 14,000 middle level schools from coast to coast.

Educators become involved in many ~~courses~~ activities beyond the classroom door for the benefit of youth. These efforts often involve some of the toughest problems facing society such as fighting drugs, assisting family service agencies, assisting pregnant teenage girls, finding employment for youth, and developing recreational opportunities, among others.

Secondary school principals hold a long interest in national programs of youth service. The roots of this interest are many-fold; student disinterest in classwork, a tragic "drift" and lack of motivation, expressions of purposelessness, increasing waves of crime, a thwarted desire to contribute to society, and an alarming nihilism. Drug use is one symptom of these problems.

Our work with dropout prevention programs has clearly established the value of practical work experience to the dropout-prone. If youth can be pulled together in small mutual support groups with a compassionate adult, if basic skills tutoring is offered, if liaison is established with the home, and if concrete work experience is provided for students, then dropouts are reduced dramatically. The nation lacks not the knowledge, but rather we lack the will to cut the dropout rate significantly. We have the tools, but they are in short supply.

The dropout problem, currently called the "at-risk student" issue, is but a part of a larger youth crisis in the United States. The crisis is abetted by society because we have no coherent youth policy in this nation. We have no overall plan or strategy to offer every youth a place -- in school and out -- to grow and develop to adulthood.

## Youth Policy: A National Void

The United States stands alone, of all industrialized nations, with no national youth policy. I repeat, no national youth policy. Australia, Germany, the Soviet Union, Israel, among others, sponsor programs for the health and welfare of youth that extend far beyond their school systems.

Here, in America, we somehow view school policy and youth policy as one. This is a serious mistake, one that damages schools as well as all youth not engaged with classwork. What is our youth health policy, other than drug prevention programs? Basically it consists of viewing youth as a market for the consumption of Pepsi, potato chips and Levis. In short, we have no youth health policy except perhaps the school breakfast and lunch programs.

What is our policy for assisting youth from disintegrated families, for assuring recreational opportunities, for generating values of public service and contributing to the general welfare? What is our youth policy for those students unmotivated to complete high school, other than public blame of the school? What is our youth policy for integrating students into the adult workplace? Do we have avenues for youth to succeed outside of the school framework?

Sadly, even tragically, this nation possesses no overall plan for youth, no rationally generated program to stimulate positive attitudes and constructive values and purpose. Should we wonder that drugs are popular for many? Should we wonder at a rising tide of listlessness among many youth?

National Service should be established, if for no other reason, to become the centerpiece of a fledgling youth policy. It would provide the opportunity for youth to serve, as well as provide important services for many youth currently neglected. "Youth serving youth" would result from youth serving their own personal growth and civic values. It is a double sum game; we create talent and purpose and motivation in those youth who serve, while we reduce delinquency and crime in the more rebellious of those youth, and in the youth being served.

## Need for Services

What would youth age 16 to 24 do in a National Service Program? How could we avoid "make work" or simple goldbricking?

Consider the list of needed services, beginning with high schools. Do we really want to improve literacy among minorities and the poor? Are we really serious about our national deficiencies in mathematics, a near-scandal? Do we really think that a teacher with 150 students per day can teach writing to these students? How many hours does it take to give ten minutes to each composition in a daily classload of 150 students -- exactly 25 hours! How many hours does it take to devote five minutes to correct an algebra quiz in a daily classload of 150 students -- 12½ hours. Perhaps student achievement would improve if teachers had aides from the National Service Corps? The United States has approximately 560,000 English classrooms, grades 9-12, in our educational system. That means that 560,000 youth could provide a valuable public service by acting as classroom and tutoring aides to the nation's high school English teachers.

This is just for starters when we define need -- just plain social shortfalls. What about programs of assistance for the homeless? For child care, elder care, public parks, nutrition programs, recreation for the poor, support services for at-risk youth . . . the list of social needs is longer than the supply of manpower available.

Why is the current drift preferable to action? The numbers required for full service are unrealistic to organize or fund in the short run. But a start should be made, with perhaps 1% of the youth cohort at age 18 -- a total of 35,000 participants.

## The Service Component of Schooling

The value of a service component to schooling has been established for over a decade. The eminent sociologist, James Coleman, rang the alarm bell in the late 1960's during the peak of student activism, arguing that youth was "disengaged" from the adult world, especially in today's commuter world of two working parents. Many youth who were polled had no idea of the nature of their father or mother's occupation, work routines, or the values required to be a successfully employed adult.

Schools responded in the mid-1970's with "Action Learning Programs", a provision by which students could engage in community-based service or work opportunities for school credit. Some school districts, including the Atlanta system and Cherry Creek, Colorado, a suburb of Denver, began requiring students to perform community service to graduate.

The scope of nationwide service programs, and their results, was documented by Dr. Diane Hedin at the University of Minnesota in a series of reports. In sum, it became clear that students gained feelings of personal worth and positive social attitudes by becoming engaged with service learning. In addition, students with deficiencies in reading and math skills gained more by applying these skills in community settings conducting actual work than in a classroom setting. The need to apply math skills, for example, created both motivation and understanding.

## Why Not Now?

Given the obvious social need for a Youth Service Corps, the scope and importance of community and personal problems that need to be resolved, and given the personal growth and attitudinal benefits accruing to youth from being engaged in community service work, why does not this nation move ahead to the obvious? Why do we fail to launch a serious National Youth Service Program?

Surveys indicate that about 25% of youth age 18 would enter civilian service in a National Youth Corps, and about 15% would enter military service. To state it bluntly, this nation is ignoring the needs of 40% of its youth cohort, while at the same time denying itself the opportunity to solve some of the most ~~promising~~ pressing of its social problems.

The youth of the United States, and society at large, need the passage of H.R. 18 this year. It is the right bill, at the right time, in the right place.

Mr. MURPHY [acting chairman]. Thank you, Mr. Thomson and Mr. Wofford.

We have been joined by our colleague from the State of Indiana, Congressman Jim Jontz. Jim, it is nice to see you.

Mr. JONTZ. Good morning.

Mr. MURPHY. For your advice, gentlemen, yesterday we called a very important caucus for this morning to deal with the trade bill, so many of the Members are popping back and forth to the Capitol. Whether we are going to redraft a new trade bill and send it to the President will be decided by 11 o'clock today, I presume.

With your leave, Jim, I will go ahead and perhaps ask the first question or two.

Mr. JONTZ. Please do.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Wofford, is it $500,000 the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has allocated in the budget for youth services?

Mr. WOFFORD. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. What department will that come under? What department is going to administer the program?

Mr. WOFFORD. It is proposed that it be under the department of labor and industry. I need to give credit, however, immediately to the department of education, because Governor Casey, in picking his secretary of education, wanted someone who strongly believed in community service being part of the program of schools in Pennsylvania, and Tom Gilhou is strongly of that persuasion.

Tom, at the urging of an interdepartmental cabinet group and the Governor established himself with a perch in his department—John Briscoe who is the coordinator for the Governor's program of citizen service. Jean Linkmeyer is his key staff person who is here, and that has been done through education, and partly because such a crucial part of this program is related to not only the high schools but both higher education and elementary and junior high schools.

One of the very best programs going on that meets some of the needs that Scott Thomson was talking about is the Pittsburgh program called Oasis that is in the eighth grade in which the 25 what used to be called the worst students and now called the most at risk students of dropping out who are failing have been enlisted in a very intense service program that is added to and gets the labor intensive kind of attention from several top teachers.

I visited this. It is in five Pittsburgh high schools. They do hard work—community service, park, and other projects. They are very proud of what they have done. To stay in the program, that have to do better each term academically, and a third of them in one school were on the honor roll. These were students that were failing when the program began.

In any case, there is a dimension for this in the junior high and lower schools as well as high schools, and higher education in Pennsylvania is going to be in the forefront of developing the program.

The Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities has approved the idea of a campus compact, calling on all its colleges and universities to organize and encourage student-faculty community service programs. President Welty of Indiana University is the head of the task force to carry that out.

So, education is a very important part of it.

Then there is the department of environmental resources which has——

Mr. MURPHY. Do you have a needs limit on the program that you are going to implement?

Mr. WOFFORD. No, because under the Governor's concept of citizen service, it is for everybody, and the department of aging secretary, Linda Rhodes, is very interested not only in having youth serving older people—and Bill Buckley's proposal for national service would have one focus program, namely, young people serving old people, as he has championed it, in homes and in other ways.

Linda Rhodes wants the senior citizens on a much larger scale to be engaged themselves in volunteer service leadership and a part of these programs.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it going to be just on a stipend basis that they will be paid?

Mr. WOFFORD. As of now, this movement, as you might put it, is diverse and pluralist and local, and it is coming up in a lot of ways. The full-time urban service corps, in effect, pay minimum wage. They call it different things, but it is a minimum stipend.

I think most people in this field would like there to be an educational voucher at the end of a program the way the Peace Corps has completion of service stipends, and the Democratic Leadership Council proposal has an annual stipend for a full year of service that would be usable for college or university or for job development training.

This idea is similar to the GI bill which enabled, for the first time, a great mass of Americans of all classes on a much larger scale to go to colleges and universities on the theory that they had served their country in World War II. We now have the bill of rights, very generous support for college and university attendance for those in need, but we don't have the GI part of it. We don't have the obligation of service.

I think the Democratic Leadership Council proposal that suggests connecting those two again is a very promising approach. We are doing it on a small scale in Pennsylvania under the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency, PHEAA, which waives loans for those who go into certain kinds of teaching under our State legislature's mandate.

The Governor is considering expanding that kind of financial incentive.

It is not a single program at this point. Colleges and universities do it differently. The high schools need some incentive money for administrative development of these programs, and that is being considered.

Mr. MURPHY. Do either of you fear that regular workers in conservation, the health care fields, and others would be replaced by a multitude of minimum wage or stipend type persons? How do you counter that argument?

Mr. THOMSON. This issue, of course, is important. It has been looked at rather carefully in places like California.

The weight of evidence is that, in fact, workers are not replaced. These are new jobs. These are jobs not currently being filled by someone on a salary.

So, I think it is not a serious problem. Even in places right next door like Fairfax County where students have gotten into something more directly like their wood shop classes that now build one house a year, in this case, with the support of the Carpenters & Joiners Union, there hasn't been that much displacement of labor in a county that is building thousands of houses a year.

Evidently, these potential jobs are not replacing salaried workers.

Mr. WOFFORD. It is a very important point in the planning of this. We have asked all the planning groups that are coming into being in Pennsylvania—Philadelphia had its first meeting of a Philadelphia-wide planning group on citizen service this Monday. In each county or each major city where we are encouraging the diverse planning group to start to work on this, we have asked that labor be fully represented in that planning.

The Pennsylvania Conservation Corps has had to work on that point very carefully from the beginning. There was a big study recently that showed how our parks are deteriorating tremendously in the State for lack of service.

So, I suppose you could say if somebody was going to appropriate money for a State park system to vastly expand its present employees, you could then view this as a kind of threat, but no one is proposing doing that. What is happening at the moment is the parks in Pennsylvania are seriously deteriorating, and the Pennsylvania Conservation Corps in one place after another has come in as a kind of saving remnant. It still doesn't begin to touch what is needed.

However, the best projects I know have the trade union participation not only in the planning but sometimes in the supervising. The construction units of the Pennsylvania Conservation Corps and also some of the Philadelphia high school programs I have seen have the building trades actually actively participating and some of their members being supervisors.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Murphy.

Mr. Wofford, allow me to follow up on that last statement and question. We did hear from one of the unions representing mostly government workers or Federal employees. They were concerned about displacement of their workers by members of these corps doing jobs union members would normally do. It has been explained over and over again that they wouldn't be doing the same kind of a job. It is different jobs.

You just described a situation of the forests deteriorating and the recreational park areas deteriorating.

We have a very similar situation in California. A couple of years ago, I was fighting like the devil to give the Forest Service the ability to charge for day campers when they already charge for overnight campers.

Now, a day camper comes in with a camper and uses the camping facility or area that has the full facilities there. He may use it all day long and then leave. Generally, those day campers that come out for that occasion leave it in terrible shape. There are no absolutes—I am talking about generally, but the overnight camper

leaves his campsite very well taken care of and clean as he found it.

So, the Forest Service in the Angeles Forest was trying to get the ability to charge a fee to the day user. This is not just a person who comes in for an hour or so to use one of the lakes or something. They would still come in. It was just the people who were seeking access to the campsite itself.

The chairman, for whatever reasons, felt that we would be setting a precedent that was dangerous. Yet, there are so many Federal facilities that do charge fees for the maintenance and upkeep that I really couldn't understand the resistance.

But in that sense that they don't want to go that way, you would think that they would want to go this way. Here we get volunteers to do the cleanup. In most of the instances in California, concessionaires run these campsites. The concessionaires repeatedly told the Federal management that they cannot make ends meet from the fees they are allowed to charge for the campsites, from any other revenues they are able to generate and from the return from the Federal Government they get per site. They couldn't, running it themselves with Federal employees, and yet on a concessionaire basis, privatization, they couldn't do it either, and yet there is no concession to make the difference.

You would think that at least in this instance, and especially in the case of Pennsylvania where it has been so successful, that you would think they would want to do something like this on a national level, to go back to the 1930's, what the CCC camps did for so many of our areas like this.

Would you respond to that?

Mr. WOFFORD. Yes, well, you do have two fronts. You have the conservation front and you have the human services front.

I think if you take the—then, if you get inside each of those categories, you have very detailed projects. I think in each case, you have to look at the actual needs in the program you are dealing with and what the present employment picture is there and work closely with the unions to make clear that you are not displacing workers.

In fact, in most cases, if you involve the unions, you will find that the union members are dealing with tremendous problems where they need help. In the school system in Pennsylvania, we have the two teachers' unions as very key members of planning this. In other places that I have been aware of—and we are now following that example—the teachers, for example, have helped spell out what kind of supplementary program they would most like in terms of mentoring and tutoring and extra assistance.

Whether it comes from adult volunteers, older volunteers, college and university volunteers, or it comes from upper grade students teaching lower grade students, tutoring them and giving the special labor intensive work that Scott was talking about—there is a wonderful report called Youth Serving the Young which shows that older high school students, for example, tutoring younger ones learn themselves while they have a great impact on the lower students.

In most of the programs that I know about, the teachers have been very enthusiastic that finally somebody is giving them the ad-

ditional assistance that they have wanted. It has to be worked out that way, it seems to me.

Mr. MARTINEZ. What you are saying, in a nutshell, is that those people who would supposedly feel threatened for their jobs are the ones that are going to decide where the help is needed. They will decide where there are services not being provided through their professional employment nor through any funds from a government agency to provide to do these jobs. They would be supplemented, in fact, by volunteer efforts.

Mr. WOFFORD. Supplementing and also enabling the existing workers in one program after another such as teachers in this example to do better what they want to do but are so hard pressed by the classroom loads they have and otherwise to do the planning, and it ought to, by dealing with the problem better, enable a team to come into being that makes it a win-win situation.

It does have to be planned well. It is easy to imagine that there could be some school or some private program or a State or local or community program that would say ah, we will save on our budget by getting these volunteers, and we will find a way to cut out the others. It has to be guarded against, but I think it has been such an obvious problem that in all the places I know of these programs, it has been worked out to the satisfaction of the existing employees, that this is enhancing and helping their work rather than displacing them.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I think if there needs to be some safeguard written into the legislation, we can do that, but I think the bottom line is that we are going to get a lot more out of youth than we are getting right now.

And it confirms, too, what I have heard that on local levels, most unions are supportive of this kind of a program. It seems that the only small inference we get of any kind of a problem comes on the national level.

Let me go to another area of concern for some people, and that is the competition between a VISTA Program and the kinds of programs in these two bills.

Since you are very familiar with the VISTA Program, you might be able to enlighten most of us on what the difference is and why they would not be competing, if you can.

Mr. WOFFORD. I am not sure I am the best person to do that in terms of the way you have thought through the bill. The way we—I didn't mention earlier that I cochaired in 1978 and 1979 a committee for the study of national service with Jacqueline Brennan Wechsler, then president of Hunter College and now head of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. It had Bill Wertz, the former Secretary of Labor on it, and Father Hesberg and Don Eberly who is here.

We worked very hard for a couple of years, and one of the recommendations—I will submit the findings and recommendations of that commission for whatever use it is in terms of your commission that you are proposing. I think we spent about $20,000 initially in a year or so and then we got supplementary work to publicize it and all.

You are providing $2 million for the commission which can well use it. We were doing this on a shoestring, but we imagined that a

Federal stipend system for national service such as now is being proposed by the citizenship—the national service plan of the Democratic Leadership Council would not compete with VISTA or the Peace Corps but create a floor on which all kinds of programs, including Federal programs like the Peace Corps and VISTA could build, that if you had a regular stipend system for national service, it ought to be meshed with whatever the financing of VISTA or the Peace Corps is and that the Federal programs would be—they in a sense would compete with local and State programs and that we would have a great diversity of citizen service programs.

Now, as I read these bills, but I am sure you know them better than I do, you seem to provide for a variety of programs to be initiated at the State and local level. I am not sure how you did provide, if you did provide, for the relationship with VISTA. I don't recall seeing that in the bill or the Peace Corps.

You may have concluded the simplest way is to just keep them on their own stream today, but you need to inform me as to what your thinking is as to those two agencies.

Mr. MARTINEZ. One of the considerations is putting the youth service portion program under ACTION. Do you believe that would strengthen the bill? Do you think that might strengthen the bill?

Mr. WOFFORD. Of course, I have to note that I was glad that the Peace Corps, again, got its autonomy when it was taken out of ACTION. I would like, however, to see the Peace Corps and VISTA part of a national service system in which they would take their place among many other programs.

As I understand your bills, you permit the State and local programs to go directly to two departments, one that deals with conservation and the other deals with human services. I thought that sounded inventive.

I haven't been part of your thinking as to how that would relate to ACTION. I like the direct access principle, thinking of it from a State or a local point of view. It sounded workable as I read your structure.

Mr. MARTINEZ. We felt strongly about that, but there is a sentiment, I don't know how big or how small, that in some way these youth service programs would compete with what ACTION is doing and what VISTA is doing. So, we are trying to reconcile any of the problem areas that there are so that we don't have any, so that we can truly come forth with a bill that everybody will join on.

Mr. WOFFORD. Not all competition is bad, I take it. In this country, we sometimes espouse competition. So, what you are not—you don't want to duplicate work. We want to double and multiply the effort.

I think some careful joint planning to see how that happens with VISTA and ACTION is called for so that the competition is constructive if it is competition and that the result will be that we multiply rather than duplicate. It seems to me you can do that.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Dr. Thomson, could you give me your feeling or reasons, if you agree, why national youth service should be implemented on a Federal basis?

Mr. THOMSON. I feel it should be implemented on a Federal basis for three of four reasons. One is, as I mentioned, we have no national youth policy, and I believe this could be the centerpiece and,

I would say, a proven centerpiece but proven in the sense of the skills that are learned, the attitudes that are developed, and the needs that would be served, proven by all of the individual and local programs in various communities around the country.

So, it would be, first and foremost, a centerpiece of a youth program. I feel that a national program is also necessary to have the financial resources to support 50,000 or 100,000 or 150,000 youth around the program.

Also, I feel a national program is important because those communities that need the social services the most and probably some of the recreational services as well are those communities typically least able to pay for it. So, without some form of national program, we continue to have the poor getting poorer, and those young people that need the help the most are in those communities least able to support it.

So, I think there are all kinds of educational, financial, and social policy reasons for having a national program.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Dr. Thomson.

Mr. Gunderson.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have been struggling with these hearings that we have held for some time, not because I am against youth service. Nobody can be against it. Rather, the question is, how does it fit into the equation?

I was just looking at the appropriation for Labor, HHS, and Education that is coming before us today, and we have a 7.5 percent increase above last year. We have $21.9 billion that is going to be appropriated for education. Yet, I think almost everyone would say that we are far from providing the necessary funding to do was is necessary in vocational and in adult education, that we are far from doing what is necessary in chapter 1 and chapter 2, that we have a long way to go in GSL's and those types of programs.

So, we get into this question again of how this fits into the pie.

I have suggested previously that it seems to me if we are going to move forth in this budget environment we are in, probably one of the few places that it can fit into the pie is under the disadvantaged youth programs under JTPA. This is something that we could probably succeed in accomplishing in this Congress.

Another option would be to wait for a new administration and see what their overall priorities are.

Do you have any reactions in that regard as to—let me say that I have really two premises that I have been prodding the chairman on, and I don't know if I have been successful in either one, but I would like to get your reaction. Number one, that we do put it under the disadvantaged youth program in JTPA as the administrative agency to deal with the coordination and delivery of service and, second, that we require some kind of an educational component.

I don't know if in today's society with our education needs and limited resources that we can have simply a public works program or a community service program for the works' alone. I don't know that we can sell it. I don't know that we can get it signed into law. I, frankly, don't know if I can defend it.

Any reactions from either of you on those two concerns?

Mr. WOFFORD. Our department administers most of the Job Training Partnership Act funds in Pennsylvania. In supporting the Philadelphia Youth Service Corps, we have drawn on several hundred thousand dollars of Job Training Partnership Act money on the recommendation of and through the Private Industry Council of Philadelphia which was one of the instigators of this program.

They felt, we feel that these programs have proved themselves as good as and, in some cases, as better job training than job training that is designed to do good to people or to help people. Asking a generation that has not been asked to do very much, has been a consumer generation, and all of the byproducts of the hard work and well administered service project produce people that are readier for jobs later than some of the job training programs.

They produce the ethic of work and of service and of initiative, and we give an example of team work. So, we feel it is a very effective program in terms of the purposes of the Job Training Partnership Act.

I would agree with you that, as our economy gets better, there does appear to be continuing recognition that not all boats rise in a rising tide and that, as the economy gets better, we have to do even better to reach the people who are dropping out into unemployment and onto the streets and into the demoralization of the people that were at risk and then they get lost.

So, an increase in the investment on that front very well may be politically feasible. We would welcome, as a State that is seeking to use Job Training Partnership Act money to accomplish the purposes of the act through the service approach, any encouragement from the Congress in doing so, whether it is in summer programs where I would hope a year from now, instead of much of the summer work program being just dividing up of jobs like the old Comprehensive Employment and Training Program, that within another year, we could get our local summer youth programs much more focused on service and well administered programs rather than just filling slots.

So, anything the Congress can do to add that standard, to add education—I agree that education, I would say, with service, ought to be an important part of that. So, we welcome that approach.

I can't help you in the painful process of your priorities, and it may take a new administration before any substantial funds would go into programs such as this. If you could lay the structure through a bill so that a new administration can see the promise and see the opportunities and have something concrete to weigh in the priorities, it would be very useful even if you don't get substantial funds through at this point.

I do think the long-term investment we are talking about here is one of those places where it is incalculable but it is very great. The GI bill of rights was one of the most expensive programs this country ever adopted, and yet I think almost everybody thinks the payoff of the additional people who went to colleges and universities and what they have contributed not only in taxes but in leadership and everything else is one of the greatest payoffs we have ever had on any program.

That was exceedingly expensive and amazing that Congress did it with such obvious potential cost from the beginning. I believe

that national service, citizen service, has just that kind of payoff, and to do it on the full scale that is called for is going to be costly.

I also think the approach that the Democratic Leadership Council, Senator Nunn, has here needs to be very seriously and affirmatively explored to add the obligation point to the benefits that are now going so that I would favor much if not all of the aid that is now going to young people being conditioned on some form of service before or after or during that aid.

Mr. THOMSON. I realize that getting any funds for education is a Herculean effort, and Congress has done an excellent job against odds getting the $22 billion for education this year.

However, I would also say that if we just look at title I, to be specific for a moment, as I mentioned earlier, we have good documentation that, for some kids, you can teach skills better in service—by skills, I mean reading, writing, and arithmetic—in service settings better than you can in classroom settings.

Perhaps some of that title I money should be transferred or obligated to a service learning situation because of the solid research we have on that. As I say, some students learn better in classrooms and some do not.

That would just be one specific small way that you might be able to get more bang for the buck, as they say.

I think also whatever might be given in the way of tax breaks to the private sector can benefit. We all know about the Boston Compact. We all know about the commitment of private corporations in the Boston area to promise students a university education if they complete schooling.

Perhaps there is something along that line that could be done on a limited basis that would get this program off the ground. I think once this program is off the ground, it will prove itself.

My testimony is entitled "Youth Service Corps: Persistent Orphan." It is a persistent orphan not because people disagree with the concept or the practicality of it. It is a persistent orphan because of the reason you mentioned, money.

I think the best way to handle the money problem is to start in little ways like I mentioned and then build on that.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Well, I am not sure most education groups would support the concept of transferring chapter 1 money into a youth service corps. I am not even sure your association, if taken to a vote of the membership, would support that particular concept.

However, I would like both of you to consider something with regard to the future. One of the strong beliefs I have is that the next Administration, regardless of who it is, I am convinced, is going to make the greatest, largest investment in manpower training that this country has seen in decades, because it has no choice. To prepare our labor and work force for the 21st century this Nation is going to be required to make that kind of investment in education and training.

I am concerned that no one is doing a comprehensive assessment of the delivery of those types of services needed to determine what is most cost effective and what is most successful particularly in dealing with the disadvantaged and hard to serve populations.

If you through your association or you, Mr. Wofford, through your work in your position of leadership in Pennsylvania and with

your colleagues in the other States could do some review and assessment and thinking in that area that could be extremely helpful to the next administration, whomever they are, so that next year, when those resources begin to flow and those discussion points on structure begin to evolve, we could have this kind of input.

I thank you both.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Gunderson.

Let me now go to Mr. Jontz.

Mr. JONTZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am sorry, gentlemen, that I was not present to hear you deliver your statements, but I have reviewed them, and I have benefited a great deal from the question and answer session, and I want to thank you for your contributions.

Dr. Thomson, I am particularly pleased to know of the interest of the National Association of Secondary School Principals in this matter. Earlier this spring, I had a chance to deliver a commencement address at Wheeler High School in Wheeler, IN, where Steve Disney does an outstanding job as principal, and I made community service the theme and mentioned the idea of a youth service corps. I know the graduates liked the address because it was brief, but I hope they also liked it because of the substance involved.

I do think linking school and education to the idea of youth service is an outstanding idea, and I appreciate your presence this morning.

I want to thank both of you for your very helpful comments.

That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Jontz.

Let me just say in closing that there is an educational component to the bill, because we consider that an important part of completion of a person's living experience.

It was very interesting to me also, and I have heard quite a bit of testimony on these two particular bills. I think that the testimony here today is good and maybe better than any we have heard because of the expertise it comes from.

We appreciate your being here with us today, and we thank you. Your testimony is invaluable. Have a safe trip back to California if you are going there and if you are not, wherever you are going.

Mr. THOMSON. Thank you.

Mr. WOFFORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARTINEZ. We are adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 10:41 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]

[Additional material submitted for the record follows:]

**STATEMENT BY SENATOR DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN**

To the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities,

House Committee on Education and Labor regarding the

**American Conservation Corps**

~~May 18, 1988~~ June 15, 1988

Mr. Chairman,

I thank you for the opportunity to once again pledge my support to the creation of an American Conservation Corps, though I realize this concept may be going under some other name these days. My comments today shall speak primarily to the legislation sponsored by Chairman Udall here in the House (HR 18) that is before the Subcommittee. I am sponsor of the Senate companion measure to this bill, S. 27, and have been since 1982, when Senator Mac Mathias and I sponsored the first ACC bill in the Senate. Much has changed in the intervening years, but nothing has happened to obviate the pressing need for youth employment and pre-employment training. Sadly, the problems ACC will address are alive and well.

I note that this bill is not the only one before the Subcommittee today relating to the idea of youth service. This is well and good -- conservation work is not the only volunteer service of value. A number of existing Corps at the City and State level are performing a mixture of both conservation and human services work. The City of New York's City Volunteer Corps is an example worthy of emulation. Its broadly drawn program covers a range of different social and conservation

needs appropriate to an urban area. The viability of different Corps structures is being proven around the country by the more than 50 existing youth service programs involving over 50,000 young people.

And so I hope my comments today on the particular benefits of Conservation Corps will not lead the Subcommittee to believe that conservation work holds some special value. Clearly conservation of public lands is a worthy aim, but so is care for the elderly and the infirm. So too is the rebuilding of schools, playgrounds and shelters for the homeless. I will speak primarily about the ACC concept today only because it is the most familiar to me, and my long association with it is no doubt the reason I have been invited to testify.

Mr. Chairman, how many of us have ever walked through a woods or a National Park and come across a trail or some structure, or perhaps a bridge or lodge, and discovered that it was built by Franklin D. Roosevelt's Civilian Conservation Corps? During the CCC's nine year lifetime, 3 million young men dedicated their time to conservation work valued at more than $1.5 billion. Among these men, 100,000 entered the Corps as functional illiterates, and left it with the ability to read and write. Many of the CCC's projects still serve us today, and are eloquent testimony to the quantity, and even more so, the quality of the Corps' work. Its benefits, both in terms of infrastructure left behind, and lives sustained and enriched through service, have been amply demonstrated.

The twin problems that CCC was formed to address -- unemployment of young people and deterioration of natural resources -- are with us once again. Teenage unemployment stands at near to 16 percent. Of the 6.6 million Americans presently unemployed, 38 percent are under 25. This is the population we hope to target.

As presently conceived, the ACC would employ up to 28,000 young people per year to perform much needed conservation and rehabilitation work on Federal, state, local and Indian lands. It would provide year-round and summer employment opportunities principally for disadvantaged youths aged 16 to 25.

I must emphasize that this is not a "leaf raking" bill. The work these kids will be doing -- and indeed, that over 50,000 of them are doing at this very moment -- is not make-work. It is real work. Hard work. It is work to benefit Americans who use public lands and public recreation facilities, which is most everyone at one point or another. And it is cost-effective work. Existing youth corps programs have returned anywhere from $1.00 to $1.20 in appraised conservation work for every dollar expended.

The President's Commission on the American Outdoors, formed in 1985 to report on the state of our natural resources, also looked at what could be done to help our deteriorating public lands. The Commission stated in its January 1987 Report,

> ". . .the need is acute for the type of activities which outdoor corps can offer. Recreation and conservation agencies at every level report sever staff shortages. . outdoor corps can and do help meet these critical needs, usually at great cost savings."

As I am sure you are aware, Mr. Chairman, the ACC bill you have before you is identical to that which passed the Senate during the final week of the 99th Congress as part of legislation to establish the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area (HR 4645). The bill authorizes $75 million annually for three years -- 80 percent of the funds are administered by the Department of Interior [Park Service lands (25%), Indian lands (5%), and state grants (50%)] and 20% by the Department of Agriculture [Forest Service lands (15%) and other federal agencies (5%)]. Fifty percent of the funds would be awarded to states and localities in the form of competitive grants. Awards would be based on the size of the state's unemployed youth population, the conservation and rehabilitation needs of the state's public lands, and local support for the program. States would be required to match federal funds dollar for dollar.

The array of work that ACC volunteers can perform includes wildlife habitat conservation, rehabilitation and improvement; urban revitalization; recreational area development and maintenance; road and trail maintenance; erosion, flood, drought and storm damage control; insect, disease, rodent and fire prevention and control; improvement of abandoned railroad beds and rights of way; and energy conservation projects.

The first ACC bill put before the Congress, the Public Lands Rehabilitation, Conservation and Improvement Act of 1981 (H.R. 4861 in the 97th Congress) was of course somewhat different than what we are considering today, but the idea was very much the same. This bill passed the House in June of 1982.

The House approved ACC again in December, 1982, but the Senate did not act on this bill or on the bill that Senator Mathias and I had introduced on February 3, 1982. So passed 1982.

And so since then, on the first day of the 98th, 99th and 100th Congresses I have introduced ACC legislation, and here we are once again -- suffice to say, we have yet to enact a bill. The bill has evolved over the years -- this year's version is much less costly than the original bill, and has a much higher state matching requirement.

In the 98th Congress, we came quite close, with legislation passing both houses. Sadly, the President chose to pocket veto the bill (although I might add that when Governor Ronald Reagan signed legislation into law to create the California Ecology Corps in 1971 he termed it "the prototype for future national implementation.")

In the 99th Congress, the House and Senate passed differing versions of the bill, and the bill never nade it to the President's desk.

Mr. Chairman, we must give it one more try. I support your efforts to enact youth service legislation to reach the body of under-eduacted, under-employed and under-appreciated youth we seem to have so little success in helping. Volunteer service can give these young people the training and motivation to enter the educational system or the work force with new skills, renewed motivation, and the knowledge that hard work can lead somewhere. Knowledge that there is a way out.

STATEMENT BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE

ON EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

HONORABLE MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, CHAIRMAN

PAUL D. DAUGHDRILL
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS ALUMNI

P. O. BOX 993
MCCOMB, MISSISSIPPI 39648

JUNE 15, 1988

Mr. Chairman, I thank you and the Members of the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities for agreeing to hold hearings on an amendment combining two separate youth service and Conservation Corps Bills to create one unified program. The Bills to which I refer are H. R. 18, The American Conservation Corps Act, sponsored by the Honorable Morris K. Udall, and H. R. 460, The Voluntary National Youth Service Act, sponsored by the Honorable Leon E. Panetta.

Mr. Chairman, I have been authorized by our national, non-profit association's President, Mr. Wayne Foster, the National Board of Directors, our Executive Director and Office Manager of the

National Headquarters and thousands of our members from all across the Nation, who were members of the CCC during the years 1933 through 1942, to present this statement to you and this Subcommittee and to respectfully urge this Subcommittee to act as soon as possible on this measure. We urge each Member to vote for this over-due youth legislation and send it on to the full Committee on Education and Labor. We then urge the Honorable Chairman, Augustus Hawkins, to expedite these two Bills and call them up for action and vote these measures out of the full Committee and on to the Interior Committee and finally to the House for favorable passage.

Mr. Chairman, I will attempt to explain why we feel this is an urgent, serious matter relative to our youth and our Nation. The time is running out for the leaders of our Nation to step forward and take charge.

Each one of you will recall a few years back when the Soviet Union's General Secretary Khrushchev was in New York City, at the United Nations speaking to the Assembly, when he lost his temper, reached over from his chair and hit his fist against the

railing in front of him. With this gesture he told the group, in a loud voice, "The United States need not worry about Russia. We will destroy you within without firing a shot." He seemed determined to leave a mark in history as an "Evil Empire".

In my opinion, his statement of threat has been coming true for a long time already. Too many of our youth today are being threatened by ignorance, illiteracy, lack of jobs, lack of discipline, poor health, lack of hope and lack of respect for our Flag and Country. Lack of morals, alcoholism, crime, drugs, and AIDS are but a few of the problems destroying the minds and bodies of our future leaders of this Great Nation.

The drugs and numerous diseases as well as other evils are imported from foreign countries into this Country. If our leaders of today will address the problems of the youth and start <u>now</u> to pay attention to them, we can save our youth and, therefore, save our Nation.

If these problems are not addressed and a method of solving them is reached soon, there is a great possibility that, in the years to come, we

could face large groups trying to over throw this Nation and that is the last thing we want to see happen.

Our forefathers looked after us and gave the youth of our times a better way of life than they had. It is our duty and responsibility to do the same for this generation and the generations to follow so that they too may enjoy a better way of life.

Mr. Chairman, I'm convinced that the Bills to which I refer, H. R. 18, The American Conservation Corps Act, sponsored by the Honorable Morris K. Udall, and H. R. 460, the Voluntary National Youth Service Act, sponsored by the Honorable Leon E. Panetta, are two bills that, in my honest and sincere judgment, are among the most important bills we have had before Congress in the last eight years. I'm also confident that, when these Bills are passed into law, they will put our youth of today, and in the future, on the right road and "make men out of boys" and "make leaders of our boys and girls" and preserve our natural resources at the same time. These young people will be taught skills to enable

them to secure and keep jobs when they leave the service corps.

I trust the recent Summit in Moscow will help to wash away the statement Mr. Khrushchev made in addressing the United Nations and the threat cannot come true because our youth will be working for this Nation and not against it.

ROOSEVELT'SS TREE ARMY

A Brief History of the
Civilian Conservation Corps

1933 CCC

The 1932 presidential election was more a cry for help from a desperate people near panic as it was an election. In a "landslide" vote, the nation turned to Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the Democratic party searching for an end to the rampant unemployment and economic chaos that gripped the country. They weren't disappointed. Accepting the presidential nomination on July 1, 1932, New York Governor Roosevelt first hinted of his personal plans for national conservation. He planned a fight against soil erosion and declining timber resources, utilizing the unemployed of large urban areas.

Professional foresters and interested laymen raised these aims. In what would later be called "The Hundred Days," President Roosevelt revitalized the faith of the nation with several measures, one of which was the Emergency Conservation Corps. With this action, he brought together two wasted resources, the young

men and the land, in an effort to save both.

The President wasted no time: He called the 73rd Congress into Emergency Session on March 9, 1933, to hear and authorize his program. He proposed to recruit thousands of unemployed young men, enroll them in a peacetime army, and send them into battle against destruction and erosion of our natural resources. Before it was over, nearly 3,000,000 young men engaged in a massive salvage operation, the most popular experiment of the New Deal.

The strongest reaction to the proposed CCC program was from organized labor. Its leaders feared a loss of jobs that could be filled with union members. They also looked with alarm at the involvement of the Army, believing it might lead to regimentation of labor.

Senate Bill S. 598 was introduced on March 27, was through both houses of Congress and on the President's desk to be signed on March 31, 1933.

Roosevelt promised that, granted emergency powers, he would have 250,000 men in camps by the end of July, 1933. The speed with which the plan moved through proposal, authorization, implementation and operation was a miracle of cooperation among all branches and agencies of the federal government. It was a mobilization of men, material and transportation on a scale never before known in time of peace. From FDR's inauguration on March 4, 1933 to the induction of the first enrollee on April 7, only 37 days had elapsed.

We in Mississippi were honored in 1931, 1932 and 1933, when Mr. F. A. Anderson, a lumberman from

Gloster, Mississippi, when, in his letter to about-to-be candidate, Franklin D. Roosevelt, he outlined the plans for the CCC's that later became law. Later, former Congressman from Mississippi, Frank Ellis Smith, wrote a book about Mr. Anderson's letter to Mr. Roosevelt. Congressman Wayne Dowdy from Mississippi had this true story placed in the Congressional Record, June 10, 1987. Following that, I donated a copy of Congressman Smith's book to the National NACCCA Museum/Library.

I truly feel these new Bills, when they become law, will help our youth even more than the CCC did for the youth in 1933. The great actor, Raymond Burr, will give his testimony as a former CCC, in favor of these Bills on June 15, 1988. Mr. Burr has, in the past, willingly given his testimony in support of other CCC Bills we have had before Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I again urge you and this Subcommittee to pass these important Bills out of your Committee to the full Committee with the same bipartisanship that was demonstrated in the 73rd Congress with only thirty-seven days having lapsed

from March 4, 1933 to April 7, 1933, the date of the first induction. Let this again be progress through unity.

I will be the last one to give up on our youth. Where there is life, there is hope. We need more faith. I firmly believe America's youth are the most precious natural resource we possess and we must remember these youth of today are our future leaders of this Nation.

In 1987, the South had a crisis situation regarding wild fires and causing Mississippi to suffer a terrible loss of natural resources. Add to this the loss of timber in California, Oregon and Arizona and the total will be billions of dollars lost because of fires. The Youth Service Corps could help replenish this valuable resource.

I'd like to leave you with a quotation that I came across a while back called, "What is Youth?"

> "Youth are people who are going to carry on what we have started. They sit where we are sitting and when we are gone, attend to those things we think are important. We may adopt all the policies we please, but how they will be carried out depends on them. They will assume control of our cities, states, schools, universities, and our corporations. All our books are going to be judged, praised

or condemned by them. So it might be well for us to pay them some attention."

Now, in 1988, we have an opportunity to give them jobs and skills by the passing of Bills S. 27, H.R. 18 and H.R. 460. Loss of youthful idealism is a shame, but inevitable. Yes, when we were young, we had all the answers. Now we have forgotten the questions. Americans, it is time to wake up and save our youth before it is too late. Save our Nation and our youth now. A voluntary national conservation and youth service program would offer young adults a renewed opportunity to earn a sense of pride and self-respect, and fulfill many pressing national human, social, and environmental needs. Mr. Chairman, members of the Subcommittee, I respectfully urge you to act soon on this measure so that we may then be able to have action by the full Committee, the Committee on the Interior, which also has jurisdiction of the ACC bill, and then the House. The time is very ripe for the beginning of a voluntary national youth and conservation service, the creation of a Youth Service Corps.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Statement Before the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities
Honorable Matthew G. Martinez, Chairman

Honorable Wayne Dowdy
4th Congressional District, Mississippi
May 24, 1988

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you and the Members of the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities for agreeing to hold this hearing today, on an amendment which blends two separate youth service and conservation corps bills into a single program. The bills which I am referring to are H. R. 18, the American Conservation Corps Act, sponsored by the Honorable Morris K. Udall, and H. R. 460, the Voluntary National Youth Service Act, sponsored by the Honorable Leon E. Panetta.

I would also like to express my appreciation to the many individuals and organizations which are offering their support expert assistance in the formation of this legislation.

The possibilities that could be provided to the youth of our nation through a program such as the one offered here are endless. I am confident that a program such as this, implemented with care and an understanding of why it was created in the first place, would bring untold benefits to the people who are able to take advantage of it. In Mississippi, a program such as this would be invaluable to the state; our children would have access to new and exciting opportunities that before would have been out of their reach. I know that there is a great deal of potential waiting to be tapped in Mississippi, waiting for a program such

as this to dig it out and expose it. I can only imagine the incredible potential that awaits us across our entire nation, but I am sure that it is there; and I know that we cannot afford to let this talent go unused.

The future of our nation lies in the youth of today, and we are allowing our future to grow stale. We must do something to revive our youth, our future; and one way to do this is through the legislation we are discussing here today.

The Youth Service Corps Program would serve a two-fold purpose. First the youth of our nation would be able to work, learn, and develop themselves into the type of citizens we need to insure leadership of our nation tomorrow. Second, the young men and women that would serve under this program would be working to preserve the heritage of our nation. By putting their time and effort into the preservation and conservation of our forests, our wildlife, and our open lands, they protect another part of America for generations to come. By working to revitalize and rebuild the urban areas, they protect a way of life for the generations that are here now.

I am proud to have been a co-sponsor of H. R. 18, and to have been involved in other legislation with similar goals. I feel that this legislation would benefit the people of Mississippi by helping to lower the unemployment and illiteracy levels that are now slowing us down. It would help the people of our nation in

same way, and with lasting effects. This legislation is written in such a way that it could have a positive and lasting effect on the youth of the United States, the youth that will one day be called upon to lead our country. Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Subcommittee, I respectfully urge you to take action on this measure as soon as possible. The stage is set for the start of something new and good among the youth of our country; all we must do is lay the foundation for them to build on. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.